

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/019,788		01/04/2002	Gilles Lebouill	11345/042001 7677		
22511	7590	01/09/2006		EXAMINER		
OSHA LIANG L.L.P.				TO, BAO TRAN N		
1221 MCKI SUITE 2800		REET		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	HOUSTON, TX 77010			2135		
				DATE MAILED: 01/09/2006	DATE MAILED: 01/09/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary							
		10/019,788	LEBOUILL, GILLES				
	on cammary	Examiner	Art Unit				
The MAILING D	ATE of this communication ann	Bao Tran N. To ears on the cover sheet with the c	2135				
Period for Reply	ATE OF UNS COMMUNICATION APP	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
WHICHEVER IS LONG - Extensions of time may be av after SIX (6) MONTHS from the set of th	GER, FROM THE MAILING DA ailable under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 ne mailing date of this communication. fied above, the maximum statutory period w or extended period for reply will, by statute, ce later than three months after the mailing	IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH() ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim fill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI date of this communication, even if timely filed	the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1) Responsive to co	ommunication(s) filed on <u>19 Oc</u>	ctober 2005.					
2a)⊠ This action is FI							
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims							
4a) Of the above 5) ☐ Claim(s) i 6) ☑ Claim(s) <u>1-13,18</u> 7) ☐ Claim(s) i	s/are allowed. -22,29 and 30 is/are rejected.	e withdrawn from consideration.					
Application Papers		olosion roquiromoni.					
•	is objected to by the Examiner						
	· ·		the Examiner				
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>01/04/2002</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement draw	ring sheet(s) including the correcti	on is required if the drawing(s) is obj aminer. Note the attached Office	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §	i 119						
12) Acknowledgment a) All b) Som 1. Certified c 2. Certified c 3. Copies of application	is made of a claim for foreign e * c) None of: opies of the priority documents opies of the priority documents the certified copies of the priori from the International Bureau	s have been received in Application ity documents have been received	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited		4) 🔲 Interview Summary					
	atent Drawing Review (PTO-948) lement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	te atent Application (PTO-152)				

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office action responds to the applicant's amendment filed on 10/19/2005. In this amendment, Claims 1-13, 18-22 and 29-30 are amended, Claims 14-17 and 23-25 are withdrawn, and Claims 26-28 are cancelled. Claims 1-13, 18-22 and 29-30 remain for examination.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 18 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-11 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over White et al. (U.S. Patent 5,983,273) herein referred to as White in view of Geer et al. (U.S. Patent 6,788,882 B1) herein referred to as Geer.

Regarding on Claims 1 and 18, White discloses a method of authenticating communication between a receiver/decoder (WebTV client) and a remote server

(WebTV server) for providing access to a network (col. 3, lines 5-20), the method comprising

using an identifier (identification information) of the receiver/decoder to authenticate the communication (col. 2, lines 5-10),

the identifier being based on an identifier for access to broadcast service (WebTV service) (col. 5, lines 50-58),

White explicitly does not disclose "wherein the receiver/decoder is not Internet Protocol (IP) enabled."

However, Geer explicitly discloses wherein the receiver/decoder is not Internet Protocol (IP) enabled (Figures 1 and 2 and col. 6-67, lines 25 through col. 7, lines 1-30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Geer's invention with White to include the receiver/decoder is not Internet Protocol (IP) enabled. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to provide the broadcasting signal in a suitable format (col. 6, lines 25-35).

Regarding on Claim 2, White and Geer disclose the limitations as discussed in Claim 1 above. White further discloses wherein the identifier is stored on a removable component (smartcard) of the receiver/decoder (col. 4, lines 5-20).

Regarding on Claim 3, White and Geer disclose the limitations as discussed in Claim 1 above. White further discloses wherein the identifier is independent of a network login identifier for the receiver/decoder (col. 7, lines 8-20).

Page 4

Regarding on Claim 4, White and Geer disclose the limitations as discussed in Claim 1 above. White further discloses wherein the identifier is based on a number unique (id) to a smartcard for use with the receiver/decoder (col. 4, lines 5-10).

Regarding on Claim 5, White and Geer disclose the limitations as discussed in Claim 1 above. White further discloses wherein the remote server is for accessing the internet (Fig. 1, col. 3, lines 33-35).

Regarding on Claim 6, White and Geer disclose the limitations as discussed in Claim 1 above. White further discloses wherein the remote server is an internet account management system (col. 5, lines 30-35).

Regarding on Claim 7, White and Geer disclose the limitations as discussed in Claim 6 above. White further discloses wherein an internet account for a user is established by the internet account management system using the identifier of the receiver/decoder (col. 5, lines 50-55).

Regarding on Claim 8, White and Geer disclose the limitations as discussed in Claim 7 above. White further discloses wherein the identifier of the receiver/decoder is compared by the internet account management system with a stored list of identifier of receiver/decoders which may establish internet accounts (col. 5, lines 28-35).

Regarding on Claim 9, White and Geer disclose the limitations as discussed in Claim 7 above. White further discloses wherein the remote server comprises means for sending data to an internet service provider and wherein said method comprises the steps of providing details of the internet account to the internet service provider to establish a bi-directional data pathway (bi-directional data connection 29) between the receiver/decoder and the internet service provider (remote server) (Fig. 1,col. 3, lines 20-30).

Regarding on Claims 10 and 19, White and Geer disclose the limitations as discussed in Claim 1 above. White further discloses wherein said identifier is accompanied by data identifying a data pathway to be used for communication between the receiver/decoder and the remote server (col.1, lines 60-65).

Regarding on Claims 11 and 20, White and Geer disclose the limitations as discussed in Claim 1 above. White further discloses wherein the remote server provides the receiver/decoder with access to a network having network protocols (col. 3, lines 30-38), and data output from the receiver/decoder is converted into data compliant

with the network protocols at a location remote from the receiver/decoder (col. 2, lines 5-10).

Page 6

4. Claims 12-13, 21-22, and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over White and Geer as applied to claims 1 and 18 above, and further in view of Shambroom (U.S. Patent 6,301,661,B1) herein referred to as Shambroom.

Regarding on Claim 12, White and Geer disclose the limitations as discussed in Claim 11 above. White and Geer clearly does not disclose wherein the data is converted into said data compliant with the network protocols by a gateway intermediate the receiver/decoder and the remote server.

However, Shambroom discloses wherein the data is converted into said data compliant with the network protocols by a gateway intermediate the receiver/decoder and the remote server (col. 2, lines 30-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the Shambroom's invention with White to include a gateway intermediate the receiver/decoder and the remote server with the motivation being to allow enhanced security.

Regarding on Claims 13 and 22, White, Geer and Shambroom disclose the limitations as discussed in Claim 12 above. Shambroom further discloses wherein the network comprises a plurality of remote devices, said converted data being

communicated by the gateway to one of said remote devices as specified in said data thereby establish a communication channel between the receiver/decoder and the specified remote device (col. 2, lines 55-65).

Regarding on Claim 21, White and Geer disclose the limitations as discussed in Claim 1 above. Shambroom further discloses in the form of a gateway intermediate the receiver/decoder and the remote server (col. 3, lines 47-53).

Regarding on Claim 29, White, Geer and Shambroom disclose the limitations as discussed in Claim 13 above. Shambroom further discloses wherein a message instructing termination of the communication channel is communicated from the receiver/decoder to the gateway using the non-internet protocol, the gateway in turn communicating a termination command to the specified remote device using the internet protocol (col. 8, lines 25-45).

Regarding on Claim 30, White, Geer and Shamroom disclose the limitations as discussed in Claim 12 above. Shambroom further discloses wherein the identification of the receiver/decoder is authenticated by the gateway before the communication channel is established (col. 2, lines 30-45).

Application/Control Number: 10/019,788 Page 8

Art Unit: 2135

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bao Tran N. To whose telephone number is 571-272-8156. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 to 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Y. Vu can be reached on 571-272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/019,788

Art Unit: 2135

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Baotran To 12/30/2005

boll

Page 9